arXiv:1603.06234v1 [math.OC] 20 Mar 2016

STABLE STOCHASTIC PREDICTIVE CONTROL UNDER CONTROL CHANNEL ERASURES

PRABHAT K. MISHRA, DEBASISH CHATTERJEE, AND DANIEL E. QUEVEDO

Abstract. This article presents tractable and recursively feasible receding horizon optimization programs for stochastic linear systems with hard bound on control and unreliable uplink. The stochastic noise in the plant is assumed to be additive and zero mean. The system matrix A is marginally stable. The proposed policies ensure mean square boundedness of states in closed-loop for all positive values of control authority.

1. Introduction

The availability of fast computing machines has spurred the growth of control techniques that involve algorithmic selection of actions that minimize some performance objective. Receding horizon predictive control, which is based on the idea of algorithmic selection of control actions, has evolved over the years into one of the most useful control synthesis techniques currently available to a control engineer. Initial forays into stochastic versions of receding horizon techniques were made in the operations research community, with inventory and manufacturing systems as the key application areas. Since then there has been a steady growth of stochastic receding horizon control in the domain of control systems, with current application areas ranging in financial engineering, industrial electronics, power systems, process control, etc. See e.g., the recent survey [1] for the current state-of-the-art and [2, 3] for book-length treatments.

As emphasized in [1], stochastic receding horizon control still lacks a comprehensive and unified treatment. In particular, the treatment of potentially unbounded noise appears to be sketchy, and part of the reason for this lacuna is the complete absence of a final constraint set that can be made positively invariant. Consequently, the conventional tools developed in the deterministic and robust receding horizon control, e.g., in [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] do not apply; see [1, §3] for a detailed discussion. The literature is even more sketchy when it comes to stochastic receding horizon control over networks that take into account the stochastic effects of such communication networks, and this is the precise area where the contributions of this article lie.

This article is concerned with stochastic predictive control under a noisy control channel. The plant is assumed to be a noisy linear controlled system, with the plant noise being a stochastic process entering the dynamics additively. We do *not* assume that the noise is bounded. Notice that even without control channel dropouts, since the noise is not necessarily bounded, a conventional terminal constraint argument á la [14] to ensure closed loop stability turns out to be impossible. Since the underlying optimal control problems are employed in a receding horizon fashion, and each of them are finite horizon optimal control problem, stability of the closed loop system under the resulting receding horizon control is by no means obvious. In the deterministic setting one selects the cost-per-stage function c_{s} and the final cost function c_{f} in a certain way to ensure stability of the closed-loop system [15]. To deal with stochastic systems, we shall impose a constraint in the underlying optimal control problem such that it is (globally) feasible and the closed-loop

Key words and phrases. model predictive control, stochastic control, erasure channel, packet dropouts.

Prabhat K. Mishra and Debasish Chatterjee are with Systems and Control Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai, India. prabhat@sc.iitb.ac.in, dchatter@iitb.ac.in .

Daniel E. Quevedo is with Department of Electrical Engineering (EIM-E), University of Paderborn, Germany. dquevedo@ieee.org.

D. Chatterjee was supported in part by the grant 12IRCCSG005 from IRCC, IIT Bombay.

The authors thank Peter Hokayem for helpful discussions.

system is stable in a precise sense. Such constraint embedding for stability is not new, and has appeared in the literature concerning deterministic MPC in [14] and stochastic MPC in [16, 17]. The control channel is modeled as an erasure channel with dropouts occurring according to a i.i.d. Bernoulli $\{0, 1\}$ random process. We assume that all communication occurs via a protocol with reliable acknowledgements of receipts. One of our primary goals is to ensure good stability properties in closed-loop receding horizon policy. To this end we select the notion of mean-square boundedness of the closed-loop process as a desirable property, and we demonstrate how to ensure mean-square boundedness under mild assumptions on the noise. To our knowledge this is the first rigorous treatment of stochastic MPC with bounded controls in the presence of control channel dropouts, and where stability of closed loop process is ensured.

Control under packet dropouts is extensively studied within the framework of sequence based control [18, 19, 20] and Packetized Predictive Control (PPC) [21, 22]. In sequence based control, packet dropouts and communication delays are studied for both uplink and downlink without any constraint on the control inputs. Hard bounds on the control inputs are omnipresent in practical applications; therefore it is of paramount importance that control strategies take into account these bounds at the synthesis stage. PPC handles the constrained control problems by solving a deterministic optimization program over open loop input sequences at each time step. It was demonstrated in [23, §2.4] that for stochastic systems, the optimization over feedback policies is superior to open-loop controls in the sense that the cost in the former case is in general lower than in the latter case. However, the set of decison variables is non-convex for the state feedback policy [24]. In case of disturbance feedback parametrization, an admissible feedback policy can be obtained by solving a tractable convex optimization program [24]. The disturbance feedback parametrization followed by saturation of feedback is used in [25] to satisfy the constraints on actions in the presence of potentially unbounded disturbance. This approach was followed in [26] in the presence of i.i.d. packet dropouts, but large enough control authority was required to ensure mean square boundedness of the states. Our results extend the main results of [25] and [26] by removing the lower bound on the control authority in presence of i.i.d. packet dropouts. In addition, we demonstrated in [27] via numerical simulations that our approach employs less actuator energy than PPC.

The main contributions of this article are as follows: We give a tractable and recursively feasible solution to stochastic predictive control for linear systems. We impose a hard bound on the control in the presence of unreliable uplink and possibly unbounded additive noise.

We present three transmission protocols and systematically show the formulation of tractable underlying optimization programs.

The article exposes as follows: In §2 we establish the notation and definitions of the plant and its properties. In §3 we provide the main results. The proofs of our results are documented in a consolidated manner in the Appendix.

Our notations are standard. We let $\mathbb{R}$ denote the real numbers and $\mathbb{N}$ denote the natural numbers. For any sequence $(s_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ taking values in some Euclidean space, we denote by $s_{n:k}$ the vector $\begin{pmatrix} s_n^\top & s_{n+1}^\top & \cdots & s_{n+k-1}^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The standard Kronecker and Schur products of matrices are denoted by $\otimes$ and $\odot$, respectively. For any $z \in \mathbb{R}$ we let z_+ and z_- denote the positive and the negative parts $\max\{z, 0\}$ and $\max\{-z, 0\}$ of z, respectively. The notation $\mathbb{E}_z[\cdot]$ stands for the conditional expectation with given initial condition z. For a given vector V its i^{th} component is denoted by $V^{(i)}$. Similarly, $M^{(i)}$ denotes the i^{th} row of a given matrix M. The vector of all 1's of length k is denoted by $\mathbb{1}_{1:k}$. For a matrix M the quantity $\sigma_1(M)$ denotes its largest singular value.

2. Problem Setup

2.1. **Dynamics and objective function.** Consider the linear time-invariant control system with additive process noise and controlled over an erasure channel given by

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t^a + w_t, \quad x_0 = \overline{x}, \tag{1}$$

where



FIGURE 1. An unreliable communication channel is situated between controller and smart actuator. The parameters of control policy transmitted by the controller depend on the transmission protocols. The acknowledgement of the successful transmission is causally available to the controller.

((1)-a) $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times m}$ are given matrices, $\overline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a given vector. The system matrix A has simple eigen spectrum and the eigen spectrum is bounded by unity. The control u_t^a is the available control at the actuator end at time t in presence of the erasure control channel. It takes values in the set

$$\mathbb{U} \coloneqq \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|v\|_\infty \leqslant U_{\max}\}, \tag{2}$$

((1)-b) $(w_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. zero mean random vectors taking values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and
((1)-c) at each time t the state x_t is measured perfectly.

A control policy π is a sequence $(\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_t, \ldots)$ of Borel measurable maps $\pi_t : \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{U}$. Policies of finite length $(\pi_t, \pi_{t+1}, \ldots, \pi_{t+N-1})$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ will be denoted by $\pi_{t:N}$ in the sequel. The control u_t^a available at the actuator end at time t depends on the transmitted parameters of the control policy and the dropouts $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ in the control channel. $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli $\{0, 1\}$ random variables with $\mathbb{E}[\nu_t] = p \in]0, 1]$ and the sequence $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ is independent of $(w_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Let symmetric and non-negative definite matrices $Q, Q_f \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ and a symmetric and positive definite matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ be given, and define the cost-per-stage function $c_{\mathrm{s}} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty[$ and the final cost function $c_{\mathrm{f}} : \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow [0, +\infty[$ by

$$c_{\mathrm{s}}(z, v) \coloneqq \langle z, Qz\rangle + \langle v, Rv\rangle \text{ and } c_{\mathrm{f}}(z) = \langle z, Q_f z\rangle\,,$$

respectively. Fix an optimization horizon $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the objective function at time t given the state x_t:

$$V_t \coloneqq \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c_{\mathrm{s}}(x_{t+k}, u_{t+k}^a) + c_{\mathrm{f}}(x_{t+N})\right]. \tag{3}$$

The cost function V_t therefore, considers the control effort that occurs at the actuator end, not just the computed control. At each time instant t we are interested in minimizing the objective function V_t over the class of causal history-dependent feedback strategies Π defined by

$$u_{t+\ell} = \pi_{t+\ell}(x_t, x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_{t+\ell})$$

while satisfying $u_t \in \mathbb{U}$ for each t.

The *receding horizon control strategy* for a given control horizon $N_c \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and time t consists of successive applications of the following steps:

(i) measure the state x_t and determine an admissible optimal feedback policy $\pi^\star_{t:N} \in \Pi$ that minimizes V_t at time t,
(ii) apply the first N_c elements $\pi^\star_{t:N_c-1}$ of this policy,
(iii) increase t to $t + N_c$ and return to step (i).

In common parlance, the case of $N_c = 1$ is known as *model predictive control*, and that of $N_c = N$ is known as *rolling horizon control* [28, 29, 30, 31]. In this current work we consider the control horizon N_c equal to the reachability index κ of the system to satisfy the stability drift conditions (11) and (12) below.

The states, controls and noise over one horizon N admit the following description under *reliable control channel*, in the sense that solely the control action u_t is sent over the communication channel at each time t:

$$x_{t:N+1} = \mathcal{A}x_t + \mathcal{B}u^a_{t:N} + \mathcal{D}w_{t:N}, \tag{4}$$

where

$$u^a_{t:N} \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} \nu_t \mathbb{1}_{1:m} \\ \nu_{t+1}\mathbb{1}_{1:m} \\ \vdots \\ \nu_{t+N-1}\mathbb{1}_{1:m} \end{pmatrix} \odot \begin{pmatrix} u_t \\ u_{t+1} \\ \vdots \\ u_{t+N-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_t u_t \\ \nu_{t+1}u_{t+1} \\ \vdots \\ \nu_{t+N-1}u_{t+N-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{A} \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} I_d \\ A \\ \vdots \\ A^N \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{B} \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} 0_{d\times m} & 0_{d\times m} & \cdots & 0_{d\times m} \\ B & 0_{d\times m} & \cdots & 0_{d\times m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{N-1}B & A^{N-2}B & \dots & B \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } \mathcal{D} \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} 0_{d\times d} & 0_{d\times d} & \cdots & 0_{d\times d} \\ I_d & 0_{d\times d} & \cdots & 0_{d\times d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{N-1} & A^{N-2} & \dots & I_d \end{pmatrix},$$

I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix and $0_{r\times q}$ is the $r \times q$ matrix with 0 entries. We define two block diagonal matrices $\mathcal{Q} \coloneqq \text{blkdiag}(\overbrace{Q, \cdots, Q}^{N \text{ times}}, Q_f)$ and $\mathcal{R} \coloneqq \text{blkdiag}(\overbrace{R, \cdots, R}^{N \text{ times}})$ derived from the given matrices Q, Q_f and R. The compact notation above allows us to state the following optimal control problem underlying the receding horizon control technique:

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\pi_{t:N}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\langle x_{t:N+1}, \mathcal{Q}x_{t:N+1}\rangle + \langle u^a_{t:N}, \mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}\rangle\right] \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \text{constraint (4)}, \\ u_t \in \mathbb{U} \text{ for all } t, \\ \pi_{t:N} \in \text{ a class of policies.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

In the presence of control channel noise the optimal control problem (5) will undergo a change due to an appropriate selection of policies. In particular, we shall employ a feedback from the process noise in our policies, which will lead to a modified optimal control problem. Parameterization of control policies direcly in terms of the noise is standard [24, 32] and it leads to convex problems under appropriate selection of the cost and the constraints. We impose the following blanket:

Assumption 1. *The communication channel between sensors and the controller is noiseless.*

Two important ingredients of SMPC are the class of control policy and the stability constraints. We shall discuss them in the following sections. The control policy class allows us to take the disturbance as feedback and to consider the effects of transmission protocols, which are discussed in §3. The stability constraints allow us to transcend beyond the regime of terminal set method. In order to ensure recursive feasibility and mean square boundedness *for any positive bound on control*, the stability constraints presented in this article are different from those in [25].

2.2. **Control policy class.** We recall that the states are completely and exactly measured and acknowledgment of whether a successful control transmission has occurred or not is assumed to be causally available to the controller. The architecture is depicted in Fig. 1.

It is therefore possible to reconstruct the noise sequence from the sequence of observed states and control inputs with the aid of the formula

$$w_t = x_{t+1} - Ax_t - Bu^a_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{6}$$

This calculation is performed at the controller at each time $t \in \mathbb{N}$. We follow the approach in [28], and employ N-history-dependent policies of the form

$$u_{t+\ell} = \eta_{t+\ell} + \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \theta_{\ell,t+i}\mathfrak{e}_{i+1}(w_{t+i}), \tag{7}$$

for $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$, where $\mathfrak{e}_i : \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{U}$ is a measurable map for each i such that $\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{e}_i(w_{t+i-1})] = 0$. It was shown in [24] that for $\mathfrak{e}_i$ equals to the identity map, there exists a (nonlinear) bijection between the above class of control policies and the class of affine

state feedback policies. The above choice is suboptimal, but it ensures tractability of a broad class of optimal control problems in a computationally efficient way using convex optimization techniques [33]. Similarly to [34, 25, 35, 28], the measured noise is saturated before inserting into the control vector. Hence, we can assume that there exists $\varphi_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|\mathfrak{e}_i(w_{t+i-1})\|_\infty \leqslant \varphi_{\max}$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, N-1$. The control vector $u_{t:N}$ admits the following form under the reliable control channel:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{t:N} &= \begin{pmatrix} \eta_t \\ \eta_{t+1} \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t+N-1} \end{pmatrix} + \varphi(w_{t:N-1}) \coloneqq \boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{e}_1(w_t) \\ \mathfrak{e}_2(w_{t+1}) \\ \vdots \\ \mathfrak{e}_{N-1}(w_{t+N-2}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &=: \boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t \mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{mN}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t$ is a strictly lower block triangular matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \theta_{1,t} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \theta_{2,t} & \theta_{2,t+1} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \theta_{N-1,t} & \theta_{N-1,t+1} & \cdots & \theta_{N-1,t+N-3} & \theta_{N-1,t+N-2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

with each $\theta_{k,\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ and $\|\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\|_\infty \leqslant \varphi_{\max}$. The matter of selection of the functions $\mathfrak{e}_i$ is left open. As such we can accommodate standard saturation, piecewise linear, and sigmoidal functions, to name a few. An interesting discussion on $\mathfrak{e}_i$ as a basis element and $\theta_{\ell,t+i}$ as a Fourier coefficient can be found in [28, §III].

2.3. **Stability Constraints.** We recall the following defintion:

Definition. [36, §III.A] *An $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random process $(x_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ with given initial condition $x_0 = \overline{x}$ is said to be mean square bounded if*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}[\|x_t\|^2] < +\infty.$$

Let us first demonstrate the existence of a controller that ensures mean-square boundedness of the system (1) if A is marginally stable. Without loss of generality we assume that the pair (A, B) is in the real Jordan canonical form. It is then a standard observation [37, §4] that then the pair (A, B) is of the form

$$\left(\begin{pmatrix} A_o & 0 \\ 0 & A_s \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} B_o \\ B_s \end{pmatrix} \right), \tag{10}$$

where $A_o \in \mathbb{R}^{d_o \times d_o}$ is orthogonal and $A_s \in \mathbb{R}^{d_s \times d_s}$ is Schur stable, with $d = d_o + d_s$. Since the pair (A, B) is stabilizable, there exists a positive integer κ such that the pair (A_o, B_o) is reachable in κ-steps, i.e., $\operatorname{rank}\big(\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)\big) = d_o$, where

$$\mathrm{R}_k(A_o, M) \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} A_o^{k-1}M & A_o^{k-2}M & \cdots & M \end{pmatrix}$$

for a matrix M of appropriate dimension. It suffices to focus on the subsystem (A_o, B_o) since due to boundedness of the controls we have mean square boundedness of the Schur stable subsystem by standard arguments [37, §4].

Two types of stability constraints are available in general: Geometric drift condition and constant negative drift condition. The *geometric drift* can not be satisfied in case of constrained control. So our main result consist of the following *constant negative drift condition*: for any given $\epsilon > 0$, $\zeta \in \left]0, \frac{U_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_o}\sigma_1\left(\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o,B_o)^+\right)}\right[$ and for any $t = 0, \kappa, 2\kappa, ...$, the control $u_t \in \mathbb{U}$ is chosen such that for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, d_o$ the following drift conditions hold:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t^o}\left[\left((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o) u_{t:\kappa}\right)^{(j)}\right] \leqslant -\zeta \tag{11}$$

when $(x_t^o)^{(j)} \geqslant r + \epsilon$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t^o}\left[\left((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o) u_{t:\kappa}\right)^{(j)}\right] \geqslant \zeta \tag{12}$$



FIGURE 2. Sequential transmission at time $t+\ell$

when $(x_t^o)^{(j)} \leqslant -r-\epsilon$.

Remark 1. *The above drift conditions push the j^{th} component of $(A_o^\kappa)^\top x_{t+\kappa}^o$ towards the origin whenever the j^{th} component of x_t^o is outside the set $[-r-\epsilon, r+\epsilon]$ by application of the first κ elements of the control policy.*

Remark 2. *The amount of constant drift ζ is chosen from the interval* $\left]0, \frac{U_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_o}\sigma_1(\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o,B_o)^+)}\right[$ *to satisfy the hard bound on control.*

Remark 3. *The componentwise drift conditions are used to remove the lower bound from the control authority to extend the main results of* [25] *and* [26].

3. Main results

We shall discuss three transmission protocols in the settings of control channel dropouts.

3.1. Sequential transmission of control.

We stipulate that

Transmission Protocol.

(P1) *The control values are transmitted to the actuator at every step.*

For each $t = 0, \kappa, 2\kappa, \cdots$, the offset vector and gain matrix are obtained by solving the optimization problem (14) discussed below. The control (7) is computed and transmitted at each instant.

For $\ell = 0, 1, \cdots, \kappa-1$, the control value transmitted at time $t+\ell$ is affected by dropout at the same time. Hence, $u_{t:N}^a$ in (4) is given by

$$u_{t:N}^a \coloneqq \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t \mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}), \tag{13}$$

where

$$\mathcal{S} \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} I_m \otimes \nu_t & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & I_m \otimes \nu_{t+\kappa-1} & \\ & & & I_{m(N-\kappa)} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})$ as defined in (8).

Example 1. *As an example consider $N = 3, \kappa = 2$. According to this protocol, the following control sequence is valid:*

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= \nu_t \eta_t \\ u_{t+1} &= \nu_{t+1}\eta_{t+1} + \nu_{t+1}\theta_{1,t}\mathfrak{e}_1(w_t) \\ u_{t+2} &= \eta_{t+2} + \theta_{2,t}\mathfrak{e}_1(w_t) + \theta_{2,t+1}\mathfrak{e}_2(w_{t+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Correspondingly, we have the following optimal control problem in lieu of (5):

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t,\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\langle x_{t:N+1}, \mathcal{Q}x_{t:N+1}\rangle + \langle u^a_{t:N}, \mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}\rangle\right] \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \text{constraint (4)}, \\ \text{control (13)}, \\ u_t \in \mathbb{U} \text{ for all } t, \\ \text{stability constraints.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In the above transmission protocol, if the control packet is lost at some time instant, null control is applied to the plant. The above protocol does not require any storage or computational facility at the actuator end.

Remark 4. *The bit rate in transmission protocol* (P1) *can be reduced by storing the recieved packets* $\mathfrak{e}_{i+1}(w_{t+i})$ *in a buffer near the actuator and the corresponding scaling factors* $\theta_{\ell,t+i}$*'s should be transmitted through the channel at each step.*

We have the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Consider the control system* (1) *and suppose that Assumption 1 holds under the transmission protocol* (P1)*. Then:*

(i) *For every* $t = 0, \kappa, 2\kappa, \ldots$*, the optimization problem* (14) *is convex, feasible, and can be rewritten as the following tractable program with tightened constraints:*

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t,\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)}{\text{minimize}} \; & 2\operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \mu_{\mathcal{S}}^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma'_{\mathfrak{e}}) + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mu_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \\ & + \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) + \operatorname{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}) + c_t \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}} \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$*,* $\Sigma'_{\mathfrak{e}} \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$*,* $\Sigma_W \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}w_{t:N}^\top]$*,* $\mu_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}]$*,* $\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})\mathcal{S}]$ *and* $c_t \coloneqq x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + \operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{D}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_W)$*.*
subject to *:*

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t \text{ having the structure in } (9) \tag{16}$$

$$\left|\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{(i)}\right| + \left\|\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^{(i)}\right\|_1 \varphi_{\max} \leqslant U_{\max} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \cdots, Nm, \tag{17}$$

for given $\epsilon > 0$ *and for every* $j = 1, \cdots, d_o$*,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:\kappa m}\right)^{(j)} \leqslant -\zeta \\ &\qquad \text{whenever} (x_t^o)^{(j)} \geqslant r + \epsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:\kappa m}\right)^{(j)} \geqslant \zeta \\ &\qquad \text{whenever} (x_t^o)^{(j)} \leqslant -r - \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

(ii) *For any initial condition* $\overline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *successive application of the control law given by the optimization problem in (i) for* κ *steps renders the closed loop system mean square bounded.*

Remark 5. *The variance and covariance matrices used in the optimization program are computed offline to reduce the burden of online computation.*

The next transmission protocol is a slight modification of that presented in [26].

3.2. **Burst transmission of control policy parameters.** We stipulate that

Transmission Protocol.

(P2) *The offset values of the control policy are transmitted in a single burst every* κ *steps to the actuator and the weighted sum of the saturated feedback terms is transmitted at each step.*



FIGURE 3. Control channel and buffer at time $t+\ell$ for burst transmission: Red block is transmitted as a burst at time t and stored in buffer. Green blocks are transmitted at time $t+\ell$ for $\ell = 1, \cdots, \kappa-1$ and added with correspoding stored offset value before application to the plant.

According to this protocol, the burst $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:m\kappa}$ is transmitted at time t and stored in a buffer at the actuator end, where $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:m\kappa}$ denotes first $m\kappa$ rows of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$. In addition, for $\ell = 1, 2, \cdots, \kappa-1$, $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \theta_{\ell,t+i}\mathfrak{e}_{i+1}(w_{t+i})$ is transmitted at time $t+\ell$. The plant noise w_{t+i} is calculated at the controller by (6) correctly with the help of acknowledgements. Hence, the burst $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:m\kappa}$ will be affected by the packet dropout occurring at time t, and $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \theta_{\ell,t+i}\mathfrak{e}_{i+1}(w_{t+i})$ is affected by the dropout occurring at time $t+\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \cdots, \kappa-1$.

The control sequence can therefore be represented in compact form as:

$$u^a_{t:N} \coloneqq \mathcal{K}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}), \tag{20}$$

where $\mathcal{K} \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} \nu_t \otimes I_{m\kappa} & 0_{m\kappa\times m(N-\kappa)} \\ 0_{m(N-\kappa)\times m\kappa} & I_{m(N-\kappa)} \end{pmatrix}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t$ and $\mathcal{S}$ are given in (9) and (13), respectively; and $\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})$ is as defined in (8).

Example 2. *As an example consider $N = 3, \kappa = 2$. According to this protocol, the following control sequence is valid:*

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= \nu_t\eta_t \\ u_{t+1} &= \nu_t\eta_{t+1} + \nu_{t+1}\theta_{1,t}\mathfrak{e}_1(w_t) \\ u_{t+2} &= \eta_{t+2} + \theta_{2,t}\mathfrak{e}_1(w_t) + \theta_{2,t+1}\mathfrak{e}_2(w_{t+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Correspondingly, we have the following optimal control problem in lieu of (5):

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t,\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\langle x_{t:N+1}, \mathcal{Q}x_{t:N+1}\rangle + \langle u^a_{t:N}, \mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}\rangle\right] \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \text{constraint (4)}, \\ \text{control (20)}, \\ u_t \in \mathbb{U} \text{ for all } t, \\ \text{stability constraints}. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The above optimization problem has decision variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t$ rather than a class of policy as in (5). Also, note that by setting some block elements of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t$ to zero, the size of the above optimization problem can be reduced significantly. The above transmission protocol needs a buffer and an adder at the actuator end.

We have the following theorem:

Theorem 2. *Consider the system* (1) *and suppose that Assumption 1 holds under the transmission protocol* (P2)*. Then:*

(i) *For every $t = 0, \kappa, 2\kappa, \ldots$, the optimization problem* (21) *is convex, feasible, and can be rewritten as the following tractable program with tightened constraints:*

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t,\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t}{\text{minimize}} \;& c_t + 2\,\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \mu_{\mathcal{S}}^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}') + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mu_{\mathcal{K}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \\ &+ \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^\top \Sigma_{\mathcal{K}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) + \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}) \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $\Sigma_e \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$, $\Sigma_e' \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$, $\Sigma_W \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}w_{t:N}^\top]$, $\mu_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}]$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}+\mathcal{R})\mathcal{K}]$, $\mu_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}]$,$\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}+\mathcal{R})\mathcal{S}]$ *and* $c_t \coloneqq x_t^\top\mathcal{A}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{D}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_W)$.
subject to *:*

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t \text{ having the structure in (9)} \tag{23}$$

$$\left|\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{(i)}\right| + \left\|\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^{(i)}\right\|_1 \varphi_{\max} \leqslant U_{\max} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \cdots, Nm, \tag{24}$$

for given $\epsilon > 0$ *and for every* $j = 1, \cdots, d_o$,

$$\left((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:\kappa m}\right)^{(j)} \leqslant -\zeta \quad \text{whenever } (x_t^o)^{(j)} \geqslant r + \epsilon, \tag{25}$$

$$\left((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:\kappa m}\right)^{(j)} \geqslant \zeta \quad \text{whenever } (x_t^o)^{(j)} \leqslant -r - \epsilon. \tag{26}$$

(ii) *For any initial condition* $\overline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *successive application of the control law given by the optimization problem in (i) for* κ *steps renders the closed loop system mean square bounded.*

The transmission protocols (P1) and (P2) do not transmit the data repetitively. We have next transmission protocol, motivated with the idea of repetitive transmissions [22].

3.3. **Sequential transmission of control along with repetitive transmission of remaining offset values.** We stipulate that

Transmission Protocol.

(P3) *The remaining blocks of the offset vector are transmitted at each step until the first successful transmission. The control values containing the saturated feedback terms are transmitted at each instant.*

According to this protocol, control values are transmitted at each instant, similar to the transmission protocol (P1). To mitigate the effects of dropouts, the components of the burst $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:m\kappa}$ which are useful at future instants are also transmitted repetitively until one burst is successfully received at the actuator end. A successfully recieved burst is stored in a buffer and the corresponding offset block is used in case of packet dropout. For the simplicity of the optimization program, the buffer is emptied after each control horizon. For $\ell = 0, 1, \cdots, \kappa - 2$, the control value along with the burst of the remaining offset components transmitted at time $t + \ell$ is affected by dropout at the same time. At time $t+\kappa-1$, the transmitted control value is affected by the dropout $\nu_{t+\kappa-1}$. The plant noise w_{t+i} is calculated at the controller by (6) correctly with the help of acknowledgements.

The control sequence can therefore be represented in compact form as:

$$u_{t:N}^a \coloneqq \mathcal{G}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}), \tag{27}$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} \nu_t \otimes I_m & 0_{m\times m(N-1)} \\ 0_{m\times m} & (\nu_{t+1} + (1-\nu_{t+1})\nu_t) \otimes I_m \quad 0_{m\times m(N-2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0_{m(N-\kappa)\times m\kappa} & I_{m(N-\kappa)} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t$ and $\mathcal{S}$ are given in (9) and (13), respectively; and $\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})$ is as defined in (8).

Example 3. *As an example consider* $N = 3, \kappa = 2$. *According to this protocol, the following control sequence is valid:*

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= \nu_t\eta_t \\ u_{t+1} &= \nu_{t+1}\eta_{t+1} + (1-\nu_{t+1})\nu_t\eta_{t+1} + \nu_{t+1}\theta_{1,t}\mathfrak{e}_1(w_t) \\ u_{t+2} &= \eta_{t+2} + \theta_{2,t}\mathfrak{e}_1(w_t) + \theta_{2,t+1}\mathfrak{e}_2(w_{t+1}). \end{aligned}$$



FIGURE 4. Control channel and buffer at time $t+\ell$ for (P3): Red block is transmitted as a burst only if the buffer is empty. Green blocks are transmitted at time $t+\ell$ for $\ell = 0, \cdots, \kappa-1$ and are directly applied to the plant.

Correspondingly, we have the following optimal control problem in lieu of (5):

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\langle x_{t:N+1}, \mathcal{Q}x_{t:N+1}\rangle + \langle u^a_{t:N}, \mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}\rangle\right] \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \text{constraint (4)}, \\ \text{control (27)}, \\ u_t \in \mathbb{U} \text{ for all } t, \\ \text{stability constraints.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Remark 6. *We can observe that* (27) *is in the form of* (20)*, hence the underlying optimization program for* (P3) *can be easily obtained from that of* (P2)*.*

Remark 7. *The bit rate in transmission protocol* (P3) *can be reduced by storing the successfully transmitted values of saturated feedback terms in buffer. A more interesting transmission protocol can be found by repetitively transmitting the future blocks of the offset parameter and past blocks of* $\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})$ *until the first successful transmission. The successfully transmitted blocks of the offset parameter and* $\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})$ *are stored in a buffer near the actuator. The corresponding blocks of the gain matrix are transmitted at each instant along with only those blocks of* $\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})$ *which are absent in the buffer but are required to compute the control according to* (7)*.*

We have the following theorem:

Theorem 3. *Consider the system* (1) *and suppose that Assumption 1 holds under the transmission protocol* (P3)*. Then:*

(i) *For every* $t = 0, \kappa, 2\kappa, \ldots$*, the optimization problem* (21) *is convex, feasible, and can be rewritten as the following tractable program with tightened constraints:*

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t}{\text{minimize}} \;\; & c_t + 2\,\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \mu_{\mathcal{S}}^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma'_{\mathfrak{e}}) + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mu_{\mathcal{G}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \\ & + \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^\top \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) + \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}) \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $\Sigma_e \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top], \Sigma'_e \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$, $\Sigma_W \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}w_{t:N}^\top], \mu_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{G}]$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{G}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}+\mathcal{R})\mathcal{G}], \mu_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}]$,$\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}+\mathcal{R})\mathcal{S}]$ *and* $c_t \coloneqq x_t^\top\mathcal{A}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{D}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_W)$.
subject to *:*

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t \text{ having the structure in } (9) \tag{30}$$

$$\left|\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{(i)}\right| + \left\|\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^{(i)}\right\|_1 \varphi_{\max} \leqslant U_{\max} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \cdots, Nm, \tag{31}$$

for given $\epsilon > 0$ *and for every* $j = 1, \cdots, d_o$,

$$\left((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:\kappa m}\right)^{(j)} \leqslant -\zeta \quad \text{whenever} \, (x_t^o)^{(j)} \geqslant r + \epsilon, \tag{32}$$

$$\left((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:\kappa m}\right)^{(j)} \geqslant \zeta \quad \text{whenever} \, (x_t^o)^{(j)} \leqslant -r - \epsilon. \tag{33}$$

(ii) *For any initial condition* $\overline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *successive application of the control law given by the optimization problem in (i) for* κ *steps renders the closed loop system mean square bounded.*

Remark 8. *Our results for mean zero stochastic noise can be easily extended to non-zero mean noise by following the approach presented in* [35].

Remark 9. *The transmitted data under three transmission protocols for the considered example with* $N = 3$ *and* $\kappa = 2$ *is illustrated in Fig. 5. The block transmitted through sequential transmission* (P1) *is directly applied to the plant. But, in case of burst transmission* (P2)*, the transmitted offset parameters are stored in a buffer. However, at first instant* η_t *is applied to the plant. For the second instant the saturated value of calculated disturbance* $(\mathfrak{e}_1(w_t))$ *multiplied with gain parameter* $\theta_{1,t}$ *of the decision variable is transmitted which is added with* η_{t+1} *before its application to the plant. In the case of* (P3)*,* η_t *and* η_{t+1} *are transmitted at time* t *because buffer is empty and* η_t *is applied to the plant. If the transmitted data is dropped at time* t*, we need to transmit future values of offset parameter at time* $t + 1$ *along with the control* u_{t+1}*. But in this example* $\kappa = 2$*, so only the control* u_{t+1} *is transmitted and is applied to the plant if successfully received at the actuator.*



FIGURE 5. The transmitted blocks for $N = 3$ and $\kappa = 2$, with given optimization instant $t = 0, \kappa, 2\kappa, \cdots$

4. SIMULATIONS

In this section we present simulations to illustrate our results. Consider the three dimensional linear stochastic system

$$x_{t+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -0.80 & -0.60 \\ 0.80 & -0.36 & 0.48 \\ 0.60 & 0.48 & -0.64 \end{pmatrix} x_t + \begin{pmatrix} 0.16 \\ 0.12 \\ 0.14 \end{pmatrix} u_t + w_t, \quad |u_t| \leqslant 15,$$

where noise sequence w_t is i.i.d. Gaussian of mean zero with variance $2I_3$ and the initial condition is $\overline{x} = \begin{pmatrix} 10 & 10 & -10 \end{pmatrix}^\top$. The eigen values of A are $\pm i$ and -1. So, the eigen spectrum of A is simple. The channel from the controller to the actuator is assumed to be of erasure type. We consider the i.i.d. channel noise in §4.1 and the correlated channel noise in §4.2 .

We solved a constrained finite-horizon optimal control problem corresponding to states and control weights $Q = I_3, Q_f = \begin{pmatrix} 12 & -0.1 & -0.4 \\ -0.1 & 19 & -0.2 \\ -0.4 & -0.2 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, R = 2$. We selected an optimization horizon, $N = 4$, control horizon $N_C = \kappa = 3$ and simulated the system responses.



FIGURE 6. Average norm of states: channel noise is i.i.d.

We selected the nonlinear bounded term $\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})$ in our policy to be a vector of scalar sigmoidal functions $\varphi(\xi) = \frac{1-e^{-\xi}}{1+e^{-\xi}}$ applied to each coordinate of noise vector. The covariance matrices $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}, \Sigma_W$ and $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}'}$ that are required to solve the optimization problem were computed empirically via classical Monte Carlo methods [38] using 10^6 i.i.d. samples. Computations for determining our policy are carried out in the MATLAB-based software package YALMIP [39] and are solved using SDPT3-4.0 [40].

In plots for SMPC the decision variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t$ are computed at time $t = 0, \kappa, 2\kappa, \cdots$, by solving optimization problem according to Theorems 1, 2 and 3, respectively. The stability constraints (11) and (12) are satisfied by putting $r = \zeta = 0.4729$ and $\epsilon = 0.02$. The control bound $U_{\max} = 15$ is satisfied by all three protocols. All the averages are taken over 300 sample paths.

4.1. **i.i.d. channel noise.** The channel noise is considered to be i.i.d. with successful transmission probability 0.8.

We compare among SMPC (P1), (P2), (P3) and PPC [22]. The plot of average norm of states is presented in Fig. 6. The transmission protocol (P3) performs better than rest. All three protocols of SMPC perform better than PPC. The average actuator energy (u_t^2) and average cost are compared in Fig.7 and Fig.8, respectively. Average cost and average actuator energy for (P1) and (P2) are comparable and less than those of PPC. Transmission protocol (P3) employs more actuator energy than (P1), (P2) but less than PPC. However, the average cost for (P3) is the lowest.



FIGURE 7. Average actuator energy: channel noise is i.i.d.



FIGURE 8. Average cost per stage: channel noise is i.i.d.

4.2. **Correlated channel noise.** We model the *communication reliability* via an underlying *network state* process $(\Xi_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ taking on values in a finite set

$$\mathtt{B} = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathtt{B}|\},$$

where $|\mathtt{B}|$ is the cardinality of $\mathtt{B}$. Each $i \in \mathtt{B}$ corresponds to a different environmental condition (such as network congestion or positions of mobile objects). For a given network state the dropouts are modeled as i.i.d. with probabilities

$$p_i = \mathbb{P}\{\nu_t = 1 \,|\, \Xi_t = i\}, \quad i \in \mathtt{B}. \tag{34}$$

Correlations can be captured in this model by allowing $(\Xi_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ to be time-homogeneous Markovian with transition probabilities:

$$p_{ij} = \mathbb{P}\big\{\Xi_{t+1} = j \,\big|\, \Xi_t = i\big\}, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathtt{B},\ t \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{35}$$

Fig.9 illustrates a simplified version of the model adopted in [41]. The *network state*



FIGURE 9. Transmission dropout model with a binary network state $(\Xi_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$: when $\Xi_t = 1$ the channel is reliable with very low dropout probabilities; $\Xi_t = 2$ refers to a situation where the channel is unreliable and transmissions are more likely to be dropped.

process encompasses Markovian dropouts and i.i.d. dropouts as special cases.



FIGURE 10. Average norm of states: correlated channel noise

We considered the packet dropout model in Fig. 9: When the channel is in "good" state successful transmission probability $p_1 = 0.8$, whereas in the "bad" state that is $p_2 = 0.4$. The transition probability to switch from a bad channel state to the good state is taken as $p_{21} = 0.9$; the failure rate is taken as $p_{12} = 0.3$.

The plot of average norm of states is presented in Fig. 10. The transmission protocol (P3) performs better than rest. All three protocols of SMPC perform better than PPC. The average actuator energy (u_t^2) and average cost are compared in Fig.11 and Fig.12, respectively. Average cost and average actuator energy for (P1) and (P2) are comparable and less than those of PPC. Transmission protocol (P3) employs more actuator energy than (P1), (P2) but less than PPC. However, the average cost for (P3) is the lowest.



FIGURE 11. Average actuator energy: correlated channel noise



FIGURE 12. Average cost per stage: correlated channel noise

5. Conclusion

This article presents convex and feasible optimal control problems for receding horizon control of Lyapunov stable plants in the presence of stochastic noise and control channel erasures. Three transmission protocols are suggested on the basis of the computation and the storage facility available at the actuator end. The construction of the optimization programs is systematic and it is useful for other protocols suggested in various remarks sprinkled through the text as well. For all protocols presented in this article, mean square boundedness of the closed-loop states and satisfaction of hard bound on control is guaranteed and verified by simulation results.

6. Appendix

This appendix provides the proofs of Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Theorem 3. For a real-valued random variable ξ on some probability space, we let $\xi_+ := \max\{0, \xi\}$, $\xi_- := \max\{0, -\xi\}$ denote its positive and negative parts, respectively. Let us define the component-wise saturation function $\mathbb{R}^{d_o} \ni z \longmapsto \mathrm{sat}^{\infty}_{r,\zeta}(z) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_o}$ to be

$$\big(\mathrm{sat}^{\infty}_{r,\zeta}(z)\big)_i = \begin{cases} z_i\zeta/r & \text{if } |z_i| \leqslant r, \\ \zeta & \text{if } z_i > r, \text{ and} \\ -\zeta & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for each $i = 1, \ldots, d_o$.

We need the following basic result:

Theorem 4 ([42, Theorem 2.1])**.** *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a family of real valued random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$, adapted to a filtration $(\mathfrak{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$. Suppose that there exist scalars $J, M, a > 0$ such that $X_0 < J$, and*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_t}[X_{t+1} - X_t] \leqslant -a \quad \textit{whenever } X_t > J,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\big[|X_{t+1} - X_t|^4 \,\big|\, X_0, \ldots, X_t\big] \leqslant M \quad \textit{for all } t \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\big[(X_t)_+^2\big] \leqslant C$.

Lemma 1. *Consider the orthogonal part of the system* (1) *given by*

$$x^o_{t+1} = A_o x^o_t + B_o u^a_t + w_t \tag{36}$$

as per the decomposition (10) *above. Suppose the pair (A_o, B_o) is $\kappa-$step reachable. Let $U_{\max} > 0$ be given such that $\|u_t\|_\infty \leqslant U_{\max}$ for all t. Then there exists a κ-history dependent policy under the transmission protocol* (P1) *that renders the system* (36) *mean-square bounded.*

Proof. Consider the κ-subsampled system (36):

$$\begin{aligned} x^o_{\kappa(t+1)} &= A_o^\kappa x^o_{\kappa t} + \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o) \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{\kappa t} u_{\kappa t} \\ \vdots \\ \nu_{\kappa(t+1)-1} u_{\kappa(t+1)-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, I_{d_o}) \begin{pmatrix} w_{\kappa t} \\ \vdots \\ w_{\kappa(t+1)-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &=: A_o^\kappa x^o_{\kappa t} + \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o) u^a_{\kappa t:\kappa} \\ &\quad + \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, I_{d_o}) w_{\kappa t:\kappa}. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Define $y_{\kappa t} := (A_o^\top)^{\kappa t} x^o_{\kappa t}$ for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\kappa(t+1)} &= y_{\kappa t} + (A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)} \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o) u^a_{\kappa t:\kappa} \\ &\quad + (A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)} \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, I_{d_o}) w_{\kappa t:\kappa} \\ &= y_{\kappa t} + \tilde{u}_{\kappa t} + (A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)} \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, I_{d_o}) w_{\kappa t:\kappa}, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where,

$$\tilde{u}_{\kappa t} = (A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)} \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o) \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{\kappa t} u_{\kappa t} \\ \nu_{\kappa t+1} u_{\kappa t+1} \\ \vdots \\ \nu_{\kappa t+\kappa-1} u_{\kappa t+\kappa-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}$ denote the σ-algebra generated by $\{x_{\kappa\ell} \,|\, \ell = 0, 1, \dots, t\}$. From (38), we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}\big[y_{\kappa(t+1)} - y_{\kappa t}\big] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}[\tilde{u}_{\kappa t}].$$

We claim that the sequence

$$u_{\kappa t:\kappa} = -\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)^+ A_o^{\kappa(t+1)} \operatorname{sat}^\infty_{r,\zeta}\big((A_o^\top)^{\kappa t} x^o_{\kappa t}\big).$$

is feasible for the problem (15).

Let us verify the hypotheses of Theorem 4. For the i-th component $y^{(i)}_{\kappa t}$ of $y_{\kappa t}$ we see that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}\big[y^{(i)}_{\kappa(t+1)} - y^{(i)}_{\kappa t}\big] = -p\zeta \quad \text{whenever } y^{(i)}_{\kappa t} > r,$$

and similarly

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}\big[y^{(i)}_{\kappa(t+1)} - y^{(i)}_{\kappa t}\big] = p\zeta \quad \text{whenever } y^{(i)}_{\kappa t} < -r.$$

A straightforward computation relying on uniform boundedness of the control shows that there exists an $M > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|y^{(i)}_{\kappa(t+1)} - y^{(i)}_{\kappa t}\Big|^4 \,\Big|\, y^{(i)}_{\kappa t}, \dots, y^{(i)}_0\Big] \leqslant M \quad \text{for all } t.$$

Theorem 4 now guarantees the existence of constants $C^{(i)}_+, C^{(i)}_- > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, such that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}\Big[\Big(\big(y^{(i)}_{\kappa t}\big)_+\Big)^2\Big] \leqslant C^{(i)}_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}\Big[\Big(\big(y^{(i)}_{\kappa t}\big)_-\Big)^2\Big] \leqslant C^{(i)}_-.$$

Since $|y| = y_+ + y_- = y_+ + (-y)_+$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, and that $\|y\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{d_o} \big|y^{(i)}\big|^2 \leqslant 2\sum_{i=1}^{d_o}\big((y^{(i)}_+)^2 + (y^{(i)}_-)^2\big)$, we see at once that the preceding bounds imply

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}\big[\|y_{\kappa t}\|^2\big] < C \quad \text{for some constant } C > 0.$$

Since x^o is derived from y by an orthogonal transformation, it immediately follows that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}\big[\|x^o_{\kappa t}\|^2\big] \leqslant C.$$

A standard argument (e.g., as in [16]) now suffices to conclude from mean-square boundedness of the κ-subsampled process $(x^o_{\kappa t})_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ the same property of the original process $(x^o_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$. □

Lemma 2. *Consider the system* (1)*, for every* $t = 0, \kappa, 2\kappa, \cdots$*, the problem* (5) *under policy* (8)*, transmission protocol* (P1) *and control set* (2) *is convex quadratic with respect to the decision variable* $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)$*. The objective function* (5) *is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)}{\text{minimize}} \;\; & 2\,\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \mu_{\mathcal{S}}^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma'_{\mathfrak{e}}) + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mu_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \\ & + \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) + \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}) + c_t \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}} \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$, $\Sigma'_{\mathfrak{e}} \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$, $\Sigma_W \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}w_{t:N}^\top]$, $\mu_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}]$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})\mathcal{S}]$ *and* $c_t \coloneqq x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{D}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_W)$.

Proof. It is clear from the construction that $\mathcal{Q}$ is symmetric and non-negative definite and $\mathcal{R}$ is symmetric and positive definite. Hence, $x_{t:N+1}^\top \mathcal{Q} x_{t:N+1} + u^a_{t:N}\mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}$ is convex quadratic. Both $x_{t:N+1}$ and $u^a_{t:N}$ are affine function of the design parameters $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)$ for any realization of noise $w_{t:N}$. It directly follows that V_t is convex quadratic in $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)$.

The control constraint set in (2) is convex affine in $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)$. Hence the given problem (5) is a convex quadratic program. The objective function of (5) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\langle x_{t:N+1}, \mathcal{Q}x_{t:N+1}\rangle + \langle u^a_{t:N}, \mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}\rangle\right]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\Big[\Big(\mathcal{A}x_t + \mathcal{B}u^a_{t:N} + \mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\Big)^\top \mathcal{Q}\Big(\mathcal{A}x_t + \mathcal{B}u^a_{t:N}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\Big) + (u^a_{t:N})^\top \mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}\Big]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\Big[x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + (u^a_{t:N})^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})u^a_{t:N}\\
&\quad + w_{t:N}^\top \mathcal{D}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N} + 2\big(x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}u^a_{t:N} + x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\\
&\quad + (u^a_{t:N})^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\big)\Big]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + w_{t:N}^\top \mathcal{D}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N} + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\right]\\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\right]\\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))\right] + \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\right.\\
&\quad \left. + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))\right]\\
&= x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + \operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{D}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_W) + 2(0) + 0\\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\right]\\
&\quad + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\mathcal{S}\right]\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + 0 + \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\right.\\
&\quad \left. + (\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))\right] + 0\\
&= 2\operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \mu_{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma'_{\mathfrak{e}}) + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mu_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{R})\mathcal{S}]\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) + \operatorname{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})\mathcal{S}]\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}) + c_t\\
&= c_t + 2\operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top\mu_{\mathcal{S}}^\top\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma'_{\mathfrak{e}}) + 2x_t^\top\mathcal{A}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mu_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)\\
&\quad + \operatorname{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}})
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3. *Consider the orthogonal part of the system* (1) *as per the decomposition* (10) *above given by* (36)*. Let* κ *denote the reachability index of the pair* (A_o, B_o)*. Let* $U_{\max} > 0$ *be given such that* $\|u_t\|_\infty \leqslant U_{\max}$ *for all* t*. Then there exists a* κ*-history dependent policy under the transmission protocol* (P2) *that renders the system* (36) *mean-square bounded.*

Proof. Consider the κ-subsampled system (36):

$$\begin{aligned}
x^o_{\kappa(t+1)} &= A_o^\kappa x^o_{\kappa t} + \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)\begin{pmatrix} u_{\kappa t}\\ \vdots \\ u_{\kappa(t+1)-1}\end{pmatrix}\nu_{\kappa t}\\
&\quad + \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, I_{d_o})\begin{pmatrix} w_{\kappa t}\\ \vdots \\ w_{\kappa(t+1)-1}\end{pmatrix}\\
&=: A_o^\kappa x^o_{\kappa t} + \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)u_{\kappa t:\kappa}\nu_{\kappa t}\\
&\quad + \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, I_{d_o})w_{\kappa t:\kappa}.
\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

Define $y_{\kappa t} \coloneqq (A_o^\top)^{\kappa t}x^o_{\kappa t}$ for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
y_{\kappa(t+1)} &= y_{\kappa t} + (A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)}\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)(u)_{\kappa t:\kappa}\nu_{\kappa t}\\
&\quad + (A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)}\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, I_{d_o})w_{\kappa t:\kappa}.
\end{aligned}$$

We put

$$u_{\kappa t:\kappa} = -\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)^+ A_o^{\kappa(t+1)}\operatorname{sat}^\infty_{r,\zeta}\big((A_o^\top)^{\kappa t}x^o_{\kappa t}\big).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\kappa(t+1)} &= y_{\kappa t} + (A_o^\top)^{k(t+1)}\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o,B_o)\times \\ &\quad \Big(-\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o,B_o)^+ A_o^{\kappa(t+1)}\,\mathrm{sat}_{r,\zeta}^\infty\big((A_o^\top)^{\kappa t}x_{\kappa t}^o\big)\Big)\,\nu_{\kappa t} + \\ &\quad + (A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)}\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o,I_{d_o})w_{\kappa t:\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us verify the hypotheses of Theorem 4. Let $\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}$ denote the σ-algebra generated by $\{x_{\kappa\ell}\,|\,\ell=0,1,\dots,t\}$. For the i-th component $y_{\kappa t}^{(i)}$ of $y_{\kappa t}$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}\big[y_{\kappa(t+1)}^{(i)} - y_{\kappa t}^{(i)}\big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}\Big[\big((A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)}\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o,B_o)(u)_{\kappa t:\kappa}\nu_{\kappa t} \\ &\qquad + (A_o^\top)^{\kappa(t+1)}\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o,I_{d_o})w_{\kappa t:\kappa}\big)^{(i)}\Big] \\ &= p\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}\Big[\mathrm{sat}_{r,\zeta}^\infty\big(y_{\kappa t}^{(i)}\big)\Big], \end{aligned}$$

where $p=\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}[\nu_{\kappa t}]$. In other words, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}\big[y_{\kappa(t+1)}^{(i)} - y_{\kappa t}^{(i)}\big] = -p\zeta \quad \text{whenever } y_{\kappa t}^{(i)} > r,$$

and similarly

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{F}_{\kappa t}}\big[y_{\kappa(t+1)}^{(i)} - y_{\kappa t}^{(i)}\big] = p\zeta \quad \text{whenever } y_{\kappa t}^{(i)} < -r.$$

A straightforward computation relying on uniform boundedness of the control shows that there exists an $M>0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|y_{\kappa(t+1)}^{(i)} - y_{\kappa t}^{(i)}\Big|^4 \;\Big|\; y_{\kappa t}^{(i)},\dots,y_0^{(i)}\Big] \leqslant M \quad \text{for all } t.$$

Theorem 4 now guarantees the existence of constants $C_+^{(i)}, C_-^{(i)} > 0$, $i=1,\dots,d_o$, such that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}\Big[\Big(\big(y_{\kappa t}^{(i)}\big)_+\Big)^2\Big] \leqslant C_+^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}\Big[\Big(\big(y_{\kappa t}^{(i)}\big)_-\Big)^2\Big] \leqslant C_-^{(i)}.$$

Since $|y| = y_+ + y_-$ for any $y\in\mathbb{R}$, and that $\|y\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{d_o}\left|y^{(i)}\right|^2 \leqslant 2\sum_{i=1}^{d_o}\big((y_+^{(i)})^2+(y_-^{(i)})^2\big)$, we see at once that the preceding bounds imply

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}\big[\|y_{\kappa t}\|^2\big] < C \quad \text{for some constant } C>0.$$

Since x^o is derived from y by an orthogonal transformation, it immediately follows that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}_{\overline{x}}\big[\|x_{\kappa t}^o\|^2\big] \leqslant C.$$

A standard argument (e.g., as in [16]) now suffices to conclude from mean-square boundedness of the κ-subsampled process $(x_{\kappa t}^o)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ the same property of the original process $(x_t^o)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$. □

Lemma 4. *Consider the system* (1)*, for every* $t=0,\kappa,2\kappa,\cdots$*, the problem* (5) *under policy* (8)*, transmission protocol* (P2) *and control set* (2) *is convex quadratic with respect to the decision variable* $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t,\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)$*. The objective function* (5) *is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t,\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t}{\text{minimize}}\;\; & c_t + 2\,\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top\mu_{\mathcal{S}}^\top\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}') + 2x_t^\top\mathcal{A}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mu_{\mathcal{K}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \\ & + \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^\top\Sigma_{\mathcal{K}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) + \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma_e \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$, $\Sigma_e' \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})^\top]$, $\Sigma_W \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[w_{t:N}w_{t:N}^\top]$, $\mu_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}]$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}+\mathcal{R})\mathcal{K}]$, $\mu_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}]$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{S}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}+\mathcal{R})\mathcal{S}]$ *and* $c_t \coloneqq x_t^\top\mathcal{A}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{D}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_W)$.

Proof. By the same argument given in proof of Lemma 2 it follows that V_t is convex quadratic in $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)$. The objective function of (5) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\langle x_{t:N+1}, \mathcal{Q}x_{t:N+1}\rangle + \langle u^a_{t:N}, \mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}\rangle\right]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\Big[\Big(\mathcal{A}x_t + \mathcal{B}u^a_{t:N} + \mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\Big)^\top \mathcal{Q}\Big(\mathcal{A}x_t + \mathcal{B}u^a_{t:N}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\Big) + (u^a_{t:N})^\top \mathcal{R}u^a_{t:N}\Big]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\Big[x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + (u^a_{t:N})^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})u^a_{t:N}\\
&\quad + w_{t:N}^\top \mathcal{D}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N} + 2\big(x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}u^a_{t:N} + x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\\
&\quad + (u^a_{t:N})^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\big)\Big]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + w_{t:N}^\top \mathcal{D}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N} + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\right]\\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[(\mathcal{K}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + (\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\right]\\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))\right] + \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[(\mathcal{K}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\right.\\
&\quad \left. + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})(\mathcal{K}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))\right]\\
&= x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{A}x_t + \operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{D}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma_W) + 2(0) + 0\\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))^\top \mathcal{B}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}w_{t:N}\right]\\
&\quad + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{E}_{x_t}[\mathcal{K}]\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + 0 + \mathbb{E}_{x_t}\left[\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^\top \mathcal{K}^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})\mathcal{K}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\right.\\
&\quad \left. + (\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))^\top(\mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{R})(\mathcal{S}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}))\right] + 0\\
&= c_t + 2\operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top \mu_{\mathcal{S}}^\top \mathcal{B}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{D}\Sigma'_{\mathfrak{e}}) + 2x_t^\top \mathcal{A}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}\mu_{\mathcal{K}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^\top\Sigma_{\mathcal{K}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)\\
&\quad + \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^\top\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}})
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1. Proof of claim (i): The proof of convexity and the formulation of the objective are given in Lemma 2. The constraints (16) can be found in [28] and the constraints (18) and (19) are obviously convex. The proposed control input (8) satisfies hard input constraint (2) as long as the following condition is satisfied:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\|_\infty \leqslant U_{\max}$$

for all $\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})$ such that $\|\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\|_\infty \leqslant \varphi_{\max}$. This is equivalent to the following condition:

$$\max_{\|\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\|_\infty \leqslant \varphi_{\max}} \left|\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^{(i)}\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\right| \leqslant U_{\max}$$

for all $i = 1, \cdots, Nm$. By Holder's inequality, for every $i = 1, \cdots, Nm$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\|\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\|_\infty \leqslant \varphi_{\max}} \left|\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^{(i)}\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1})\right| &= \left|\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{(i)}\right| + \left\|\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t^{(i)}\right\|_1 \varphi_{\max}\\
&\leqslant U_{\max}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the constraint (17) is equivalent to hard control constraint (2). Now, it remains to show that the constraints (18) and (19) are both feasible and that they imply that the drift conditions (11) and (12) are satisfied. Consider the sequence of control input vectors

$$\tilde{u}_{t:\kappa} = -\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)^+ A_o^{\kappa(t+1)} \operatorname{sat}^\infty_{r,\zeta}\big((A_o^\top)^{\kappa t} x_t^o\big) \tag{41}$$

for $\zeta \in \left]0, \frac{U_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_o}\sigma_1(\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o,B_o)^+)}\right[$. Substituting the input above into the left hand side of (11), we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{x^o}\left[\Big((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)u_{t:\kappa}\Big)^{(j)}\right] \leqslant -\zeta,$$

whenever $(x_t^o)^{(j)} \geqslant r + \epsilon$. Similarly, the control sequence (41) satisfies (12) whenever $(x_t^o)^{(j)} \leqslant -r - \epsilon$. Moreover, the controls are bounded by $U_{\max}$ by construction because for $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\ell \in \{0, 1, \cdots, \kappa - 1\}$,

$$\|\tilde{u}_{t+\ell}\| \leqslant \|\tilde{u}_{t:\kappa}\| \leqslant \sigma_1(\mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)^+)\sqrt{d_o}\zeta \leqslant U_{\max}.$$

Therefore, we have shown that there exists a sequence of input vectors $\tilde{u}_{t:\kappa}$ that is feasible with respect to the input constraint set (2). Moreover, this policy is encompassed with the genral policy structure (8), as we can set the design parameter to $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})_{1:\kappa m} = \tilde{u}_{t:\kappa}$ and $(\tilde{\Theta})_{1:\kappa m} = 0$.

Now, the sequence of the control inputs can be written in terms of decision variables as

$$u_{t:\kappa} \coloneqq (\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:\kappa m} + (\boldsymbol{\Theta}_t)_{1:\kappa m}\mathfrak{e}(w_{t:N-1}). \tag{42}$$

Combining (42) with the stability constraint (11), we obtain

$$\Big((A_o^\kappa)^\top \mathrm{R}_\kappa(A_o, B_o)(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)_{1:\kappa m}\Big)^{(j)} \leqslant -\zeta,$$

whenever $(x_t^o)^{(j)} \geqslant r + \epsilon$. Accordingly, if the constraint (18) is satisfied then (11) is satisfied as well. Similarly, combining (42) with the stability constraint (12), we conclude if the constraint (19) is satisfied then (12) is also satisfied. This completes the claim (i) of Theorem 1.

Proof of claim (ii): It is shown in [28] that the Schur stable system, under bounded control inputs, is mean square bounded. Hence, claim (ii) is directly implied by Lemma 1. □

Proof of Theorem 2. Claims (i) and (ii) follow immediately from Lemma 4 and 3, respectively, along the same lines of arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Claims (i) and (ii) follow immediately from Lemma 4 and 3, respectively, with the same lines of arguments as in proof of Theorem 1. The only difference is that the matrix $\mathcal{K}$ is replaced by $\mathcal{G}$ in the present case. □

References

[1] D. Q. Mayne, "Model predictive control: Recent developments and future promise," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 2967 – 2986, 2014.

[2] L. Grüne and J. Pannek, *Nonlinear model predictive control*. Springer, 2011.

[3] J. B. Rawlings and D. Q. Mayne, *Model predictive control: theory and design*. Nob Hill, Madison, Wisconsin, 2009.

[4] A. Bemporad and M. Morari, "Control of systems integrating logic, dynamics, and constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 407–427, 1999.

[5] J. Rossiter, B. Kouvaritakis, and M. Rice, "A numerically robust state-space approach to stable-predictive control strategies," *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 65–73, 1998.

[6] E. C. Kerrigan and J. M. Maciejowski, "Feedback min-max model predictive control using a single linear program: robust stability and the explicit solution," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 395–413, 2004.

[7] E. Hartley and J. Maciejowski, "Initial tuning of predictive controllers by reverse engineering," in *European Control Conference (ECC), 2009*, Aug 2009, pp. 725–730.

[8] D. Marruedo, T. Alamo, and E. Camacho, "Input-to-state stable MPC for constrained discrete-time nonlinear systems with bounded additive uncertainties," in *Proceedings of the 41st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2002.*, vol. 4, 2002.

[9] F. Bayer, B. Mathias, and F. Allgower, "Discrete-time Incremental ISS : A Framework for Robust NMPC," *European Control Conference*, pp. 2068–2073, 2013.

[10] S. V. Rakovic, E. C. Kerrigan, K. I. Kouramas, and D. Q. Mayne, "Invariant approximations of the minimal robust positively invariant set," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 406–410, 2005.

[11] S. V. Rakovic, B. Kouvaritakis, M. Cannon, C. Panos, and R. Findeisen, "Parameterized tube model predictive control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 2746–2761, 2012.

[12] U. Maeder, F. Borrelli, and M. Morari, "Linear offset-free model predictive control," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 2214–2222, 2009.

[13] D. E. Quevedo, G. C. Goodwin, and J. A. De Dona, "Finite constraint set receding horizon quadratic control," *International journal of robust and nonlinear control*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 355–377, 2004.

[14] D. Mayne, J. Rawlings, C. Rao, and P. Scokaert, "Constrained model predictive control: Stability and optimality," vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 789–814, 2000.

[15] S. S. Keerthi and E. G. Gilbert, "Optimal infinite-horizon feedback laws for a general class of constrained discrete-time systems: stability and moving-horizon approximations," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 265–293, 1988.

[16] D. Chatterjee, F. Ramponi, P. Hokayem, and J. Lygeros, "On mean square boundedness of stochastic linear systems with bounded controls," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 375–380, 2012.

[17] D. Bernardini, M. Donkers, A. Bemporad, and W. Heemels, "A model predictive control approach for stochastic networked control systems," in *2nd IFAC Workshop on Estimation and Control of Networked Systems, Annecy, France*, vol. 3, 2010, pp. 7–12.

[18] J. Fischer, M. Dolgov, and U. D. Hanebeck, "On stability of sequence-based LQG control," in *52nd Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 2013*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 6627–6633.

[19] J. Fischer, A. Hekler, M. Dolgov, and U. D. Hanebeck, "Optimal Sequence-Based LQG Control over TCP-like Networks Subject to Random Transmission Delays and Packet Losses," *Proceedings of the 2013 American Control Conference (ACC 2013)*, pp. 1543–1549, 2013.

[20] A. Hekler, J. Fischer, and U. D. Hanebeck, "Control over Unreliable Networks Based on Control Input Densities," *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Information Fusion (Fusion 2012) (to appear)*, pp. 1277–1283, 2012.

[21] D. E. Quevedo and D. Nešić, "Input-to-state stability of packetized predictive control over unreliable networks affected by packet-dropouts," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 370–375, 2011.

[22] ——, "Robust stability of packetized predictive control of nonlinear systems with disturbances and Markovian packet losses," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 1803–1811, 2012.

[23] P. R. Kumar and P. Varaiya, *Stochastic systems: estimation, identification and adaptive control*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1986.

[24] P. J. Goulart, E. C. Kerrigan, and J. M. MacIejowski, "Optimization over state feedback policies for robust control with constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 523–533, 2006.

[25] P. Hokayem, D. Chatterjee, F. Ramponi, G. Chaloulos, and J. Lygeros, "Stable stochastic receding horizon control of linear systems with bounded control inputs," in *Proceedings of 19th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems, Budapest, Hungary*, 2010, pp. 31–36.

[26] D. Chatterjee, S. Amin, P. Hokayem, J. Lygeros, and S. S. Sastry, "Mean-square boundedness of stochastic networked control systems with bounded control inputs," in *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 2010*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 4759–4764.

[27] D. E. Quevedo, P. K. Mishra, R. Findeisen, and D. Chatterjee, "A stochastic model predictive controller for systems with unreliable communications," in *5th IFAC Conference on Nonlinear Model Predictive Control, 2015*. IFAC, 2015, in press.

[28] D. Chatterjee, P. Hokayem, and J. Lygeros, "Stochastic receding horizon control with bounded control inputs—a vector-space approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 2704–2711, 2011.

[29] D. E. Quevedo, G. C. Goodwin, and J. S. Welsh, "Minimizing down-link traffic in networked control systems via optimal control techniques," in *42nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2003.*, vol. 2. IEEE, 2003, pp. 1200–1205.

[30] K. Aboudolas, M. Papageorgiou, A. Kouvelas, and E. Kosmatopoulos, "A rolling-horizon quadratic-programming approach to the signal control problem in large-scale congested urban road networks," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 680–694, 2010.

[31] C. E. Garcia, D. M. Prett, and M. Morari, "Model predictive control: theory and practice – a survey," *Automatica*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 335–348, 1989.

[32] J. Lofberg, "Approximations of closed-loop minimax MPC," in *42nd IEEE International Conference on Decision and Control (IEEE Cat. No.03CH37475)*, vol. 2, 2003, pp. 1438–1442.

[33] E. Cinquemani, M. Agarwal, D. Chatterjee, and J. Lygeros, "Convexity and convex approximations of discrete-time stochastic control problems with constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 2082–2087, 2011.

[34] P. Hokayem, E. Cinquemani, D. Chatterjee, F. Ramponi, and J. Lygeros, "Stochastic receding horizon control with output feedback and bounded controls," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 77–88, 2012.

[35] P. Hokayem, D. Chatterjee, and J. Lygeros, "On stochastic receding horizon control with bounded control inputs," *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6359–6364, 2009.

[36] D. Chatterjee and J. Lygeros, "On stability and performance of stochastic predictive control techniques," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 509–514, Feb 2015.

[37] F. Ramponi, D. Chatterjee, A. Milias-Argeitis, P. Hokayem, and J. Lygeros, "Attaining mean square boundedness of a marginally stable stochastic linear system with a bounded control input," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 2414–2418, 2010.

[38] C. Robert and G. Casella, *Monte Carlo statistical methods*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[39] J. Lofberg, "Yalmip: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in matlab," in *International Symposium on Computer Aided Control Systems Design, 2004*. IEEE, 2004, pp. 284–289.

[40] K.-C. Toh, M. J. Todd, and R. H. Tütüncü, "On the implementation and usage of sdpt3–a matlab software package for semidefinite-quadratic-linear programming, version 4.0," in *Handbook on semidefinite, conic and polynomial optimization*. Springer, 2012, pp. 715–754.

[41] D. E. Quevedo, A. Ahlen, and K. H. Johansson, "State estimation over sensor networks with correlated wireless fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 581–593, 2013.

[42] R. Pemantle and J. S. Rosenthal, "Moment conditions for a sequence with negative drift to be uniformly bounded in L^r," *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, vol. 82, no. 1, pp. 143–155, 1999.